

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 24, 2003. Claims 1 to 16 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 6, 13 and 15 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicant again thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 1 to 5. These claims have not been amended and are believed to remain allowable.

Claims 6 to 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,502,147 (Reilly). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to data processing in connection with an external device. One aspect of the present invention lies in the feature of inputting an instruction which indicates that the external device is to be informed of a result of a processing of a job, or which indicates that the external device is not to be informed of a result of a processing of a job. In this way, informing an external device of a result of a processing of a job can be avoided if unnecessary, based on input of an instruction which precisely indicates whether or not this is desired.

With specific reference to the claims, independent Claim 6 recites a data processing apparatus that comprises connection means for connecting to an external device. The data processing apparatus also comprises input means for inputting a first instruction to execute a job, and a second instruction which indicates that the external device is to be informed of a result of a processing of the job or which indicates that the

external device is not to be informed of a result of a processing of the job. The data processing apparatus further comprises processing means for processing the job based on the instruction input by the input means, and informing means for informing the external device of the result of the job processing executed by the processing means through the connection means when the external device is to be informed of the result of the job processing.

Independent Claims 13 and 15 are method and computer readable program claims, respectively, that correspond generally to Claim 6.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of independent Claims 6, 13 and 15, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of an instruction (input) which indicates that the external device is to be informed of a result of a processing of the job or which indicates that the external device is not to be informed of a result of a processing of the job.

Reilly relates to a centralized queue for a network printing system. The centralized queue allows clients of a network printer to make job requests and enter a spot in a job queue without transmitting the actual print job data to the network (see Abstract). Reilly teaches that an enumerate queue command can be transmitted from a requesting host computer to obtain an ordered list of the jobs in the print queue (column 4, lines 49-52). The Office Action contends that Reilly's enumerate queue command corresponds to the present invention's instruction (input) which indicates that the external device is to be informed of a result of a processing of the job or which indicates that the external device is not to be informed of a result of a processing of the job.

More specifically, the Office Action, on page 6, argues that Reilly teaches that the enumerate queue command may or may not be transmitted, and if the enumerate queue command is not transmitted, the host computer cannot obtain the list of jobs. The Office Action equates this situation with the present invention's claim of an instruction not to inform an external device of a result of a processing of a job. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this position. The absence of an instruction to obtain information for a host computer (as in Reilly) is different from an actual instruction which indicates that the information should not be obtained. The present invention does not rely on some default actions in the absence of an instruction, but rather relies on an instruction that specifically indicates that the external device is to be informed or is not to be informed.

As such, Reilly is not seen to disclose or suggest an instruction (input) which indicates that the external device is to be informed of a result of a processing of the job or which indicates that the external device is not to be informed of a result of a processing of the job.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing, independent Claims 6, 13 and 15 are believed to be allowable.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. Difesa

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 32622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 74920 v 1